

# THE CHRONICLE

D. F. WRIGHT, M. D., Editor.

TERMS: \$3.00 IN ADVANCE.

CLARKSVILLE: JULY 29, 1876.

## NATIONAL DEMOCRATIC TICKET

FOR PRESIDENT,

**SAMUEL J. TILDEN,**

OF New York.

FOR VICE-PRESIDENT,

**THOS. A. HENDRICKS,**

OF Indiana.

FOR REPRESENTATIVE,

**CHARLES G. SMITH,**

FOR FLOATER,

**COL. N. BRANDON,**

OF Stewart County.

**COL. SAVAGE AND HIS OPINIONS.**

During last week some curiosity was

excited by the announcement that Col.

Savage, of McMinnville, was expected

to make a speech in this place. He

was invited to do so by three gentlemen

who supposed him to hold opinions

entirely at variance with those of the

majority of the people here. But the

attention of the public was further

attracted by an informal announcement

that after the speech the company

assembled would be resolved into a

mass meeting for the purpose of de-

vising measures for carrying out the

principles to be enunciated by the

orator. Under these stimuli to pub-

lic attention, it is not surprising that

an audience of perhaps 500 assembled

at the usual time last Saturday

evening, and that the speaker, espe-

cially as a good many country peo-

ple are usually in town on that day.

We hardly think that half of these

were of the same opinion, even with

the gentlemen who got up the affair,

nor do we believe that three could be

mustered who agreed entirely with the

speaker in the views he promulgated.

THE SPEECH.

We have not space to analyze the

whole speech; it was divided nearly

equally between the national debt and

the State debt, both of which were

pronounced to be illegally incurred,

and both it was contended should be

immediately and totally repaid. As

regards the national debt, the speaker

maintained that it was not a debt, but

that it had been incurred by the State

in violation of the Federal Constitution,

and that the refusal to pay them was

nothing but a plain assertion of a

just principle, while repudiation could

only designate the refusal to pay a

debt justly due.

The practical character which we

desire to give to these editorial articles

will prevent our noticing what he says

in reference to the Federal debt, as it

is not material to the present argu-

ment. We will, therefore, confine our

remarks to the State debt, and we

practically before the people. If it ever

should be presented practically before

the nation it would, we think, be dis-

cussed at the point of the bayonet

rather than with such arguments as we

are in the habit of using; we therefore

limit our attention to his proposed

treatment of the State debt.

We have said already that he main-

tains this to be no debt at all, and

therefore to be no concern of the peo-

ple of Tennessee. This is the sum

and substance of the argument.

The plain reply to this argument is

the statement of the rudimentary prin-

ciple of the United States constitu-

tion, that the States are sovereigns,

and that their governments possess

all the attributes of sovereign power

which have not been withheld by

limitation, either in the form of

limitation in the State constitution, or

in that of express concession to the

Federal government. This is the prin-

ciple of the United States constitu-

tion, and it is a delegated authority, the creature

## CONVENTION AT INDIAN MOUND.

This convention consisted of dele-

gates from the counties of Montgom-

ery and Stewart, and was held for

the purpose of nominating a candidate

for joint representative for the two

counties.

The delegates from Montgomery

county professed to those from Ste-

wart county the selection of a candidate to

be nominated, the Stewart delegates

accordingly held a separate caucus

for the purpose; but failed in giving a

two-thirds vote to any one candidate,

accordingly they presented two names

to the convention. These were Col.

Nathan Brandon, of Dover, and A.

Bagwell, Jr., of Indian Mound.

The business of the convention

proper, now commenced, Major J.

Graham, of Stewart, was elected

permanent Chairman, and Rufus N.

Rhodes, Esq., of Montgomery, and Mr.

Flood, editor of the Dover Record

secretaries.

Committee on credentials was then

appointed, consisting of Messrs. Wm.

Martin of Montgomery, Jas. Lewis

and Capt. Graham, of Stewart.

Committee on basis of representa-

tion: B. Y. Johnson, of Montgomery,

Alex. Richards and Geo. Smith, of

Stewart.

The committee on credentials re-

ported the following delegates to the

convention:

From Montgomery, Dr. L. B. Chil-

ton, R. Y. Johnson, Geo. Smith, Hon.

Wm. Martin, Dr. D. Johnson, E. B.

Luttrell, C. S. Daniel, J. D. Neblett,

R. N. Rhodes, J. W. Radolph, R. H.

Barney and S. W. Martin.

From Stewart, W. H. Brown, W.

H. Hall, W. L. Dunbar, A. C. Rich-

ards, W. B. Halliday, J. W. Richards,

D. L. Howell, H. Killebrew, R. B.

Leavelle, J. M. Lewis, T. W. Nichol-

son, R. E. Thomas, A. Townsend, W. G.

Wilson, S. Graham, Dr. J. W. Smith,

Tharp, W. H. Bell, Maj. J. W. Gor-

ham, E. J. Shackelford, J. W. Rice,

P. D. Wofford and S. T. Dillen.

Committee on basis of representa-

tion. Each county entitled to one

delegate for every 50 Democratic votes

polled in the last State election. Mon-

tgomery county, 44 votes; Stewart, 25.

While the committees were engaged

in deliberation, Judge C. W. Tyler

made an eloquent speech in behalf

of harmony. Nominations were then

declared in order. Before names

were presented, however, the Demo-

cratic two-thirds rule was adopted.

Clay Stacker, of Stewart, then pre-

sented the name of Col. Nathan Bran-

don, and Capt. A. C. Richards that of

A. Bagwell, Jr.

When Stewart county was called

the cast her vote as follows: Brandon

16; Bagwell 9.

Dr. Chilton then, as Chairman of

the Montgomery delegates, cast the

Montgomery vote as follows: Brandon

41; — 3.

The Secretary of the convention

then announced the united vote as

follows: Brandon 57; Bagwell 12.

3. Which at once determined the

nomination in favor of Col. Brandon.

W. L. Dunbar, Esq., then proposed

to make the nomination unanimous,

which was done by acclamation.—

Messrs. J. E. Rice, A. Townsend and

B. D. Johnson were then appointed to

announce his nomination to Col. Bran-

don.

Convention then adjourned for din-

ner. Apropos of this, the convention

expressed in enthusiastic terms of the

praiseworthy hospitality of Dr. W. A. West.

After dinner the following resolu-

tion, offered by J. W. Rice, Esq., was

enthusiastically voted:

Resolved, That we, the delegates

## THE MASS MEETING.

was now in order, but unfortunately

the mass was not there; Col. Savage's

speech did not seem successful in keep-

ing together a crowd which had never

been a large one, and another little

event tended to reduce it still further.

The speaker stepped forward in the

person of

MR. BERRY LYLE.

Mr. Lyle was once rather conspicu-

ous as a radical member of our State

legislature, by some maneuver he had

managed to obtain the consent of the

temporary chairman, Mr. Charles

Stuart, to have the floor for a quarter

of an hour, and, against the repeated

protests of that gentleman, who was

visibly annoyed by the matter, he man-

aged to appropriate the other three

quarters.

We will not attempt to give the sub-

stance of this speech, as we could not

find it in our power to do so. It was

well known, however, that he would

be, being a lawyer and an old State

rights Democrat, believes in its validity

himself. He alleges that whereas no

authority is given in the constitution

of the State to its legislature to issue

bonds while such authority is expressly

granted to the Federal government, it

is as manifest that the people intended

to withhold this power from the State

government, as that it granted it to

the national legislature. This is the

sum and substance of the argument.

The plain reply to this argument is

the statement of the rudimentary prin-

ciple of the United States constitu-

tion, that the States are sovereigns,

and that their governments possess

all the attributes of sovereign power

which have not been withheld by

limitation, either in the form of

limitation in the State constitution, or

in that of express concession to the

Federal government. This is the prin-

ciple of the United States constitu-

tion, and it is a delegated authority, the creature

of the United States government, and

therefore to be no concern of the peo-

ple of Tennessee. This is the sum

and substance of the argument.

The plain reply to this argument is

the statement of the rudimentary prin-

ciple of the United States constitu-

tion, that the States are sovereigns,

and that their governments possess

all the attributes of sovereign power

which have not been withheld by

limitation, either in the form of

limitation in the State constitution, or

in that of express concession to the

Federal government. This is the prin-

ciple of the United States constitu-

tion, and it is a delegated authority, the creature

of the United States government, and

therefore to be no concern of the peo-

ple of Tennessee. This is the sum

and substance of the argument.

The plain reply to this argument is

the statement of the rudimentary prin-

ciple of the United States constitu-

tion, that the States are sovereigns,

and that their governments possess

all the attributes of sovereign power

which have not been withheld by

limitation, either in the form of

limitation in the State constitution, or

in that of express concession to the

Federal government. This is the prin-

ciple of the United States constitu-

tion, and it is a delegated authority, the creature

of the United States government, and

therefore to be no concern of the peo-

ple of Tennessee. This is the sum

and substance of the argument.

The plain reply to this argument is

the statement of the rudimentary prin-

ciple of the United States constitu-

tion, that the States are sovereigns,

and that their governments possess

all the attributes of sovereign power

which have not been withheld by

## CONVENTION AT INDIAN MOUND.

This convention consisted of dele-

gates from the counties of Montgom-

ery and Stewart, and was held for

the purpose of nominating a candidate

for joint representative for the two

counties.

The delegates from Montgomery

county professed to those from Ste-

wart county the selection of a candidate to

be nominated, the Stewart delegates

accordingly held a separate caucus

for the purpose; but failed in giving a

two-thirds vote to any one candidate,

accordingly they presented two names

to the convention. These were Col.

Nathan Brandon, of Dover, and A.

Bagwell, Jr., of Indian Mound.

The business of the convention

proper, now commenced, Major J.

Graham, of Stewart, was elected

permanent Chairman, and Rufus N.

Rhodes, Esq., of Montgomery, and Mr.